

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

JANUARY 11, 1861.—Submitted and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAVIS made the following

REPORT.

The Committee on Military Affairs and the Militia, to whom was referred the resolution of the 11th December, 1860, "to inquire whether the expenses of that branch of the public service (the Army) cannot be reduced without detriment to the public service," &c., having had the same under consideration, report:

That entering upon the investigation of this subject with an anxiety to arrive at some practical result, they addressed an inquiry to the Secretary of War, who replied as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
December 27, 1860.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 13th instant, I beg leave to refer you to the inclosed reports of the chiefs of the several bureaus, as communicating in detail the information desired by your committee touching the reduction of the expenses of the military establishment.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

JOHN B. FLOYD,
Secretary of War.

Hon. JEFFERSON DAVIS,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs, Senate.

OFFICE, COMMISSARY GENERAL SUBSISTENCE,
Washington, December 17, 1860.

SIR: In compliance with your instructions to report upon the communication of the Hon. Jefferson Davis, chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and the Militia, of the 13th instant, I have the honor to state that whilst the strength of the Army continues as at present, and is employed in the same manner, I know of no reduction which can be made in the expenditure for its subsistence.

Very respectfully, your most obedient servant,

J. P. TAYLOR,
Acting Commissary General Subsistence.

Hon. JOHN B. FLOYD,
Secretary of War.

SURGEON GENERAL'S OFFICE,
December 17, 1860.

SIR: In reply to a communication referred by you to this office, from the chairman of the Military Committee of the Senate, inquiring "whether the expenses in the military department of the government cannot be reduced without detriment to the public service," I have the honor to report that the expenditures of the medical and hospital department of the Army have always been regulated with a view to the utmost economy.

It is not believed that these expenditures can be reduced in a single item without a sacrifice of the welfare of the soldier and the true interests of the public service.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

By order.

R. C. WOOD,
Surgeon, United States Army.

Hon. JOHN B. FLOYD,
Secretary of War.

ENGINEER DEPARTMENT,
December 18, 1860.

SIR: In answer to the resolution of the Military Committee of the Senate, adopted on the 11th instant, inquiring whether the expenses of the military department of the government cannot be reduced without detriment to the public service, I have the honor to report that the number of engineer officers in service is barely sufficient to perform the various duties connected with that branch of the service. That in most instances it falls, of necessity, to the lot of the officers in charge of fortifications to have three or four of them at a time under their supervision; and finally, that the demand of engineer officers for the Military Academy is with difficulty supplied.

Under these circumstances, I can see no way by which the expenses of the corps of engineers could be reduced without actual and serious detriment to the service.

In regard to the appropriations usually disbursed by the corps, viz: those for fortifications, it will be seen by comparison of the estimates presented by this office for several years past with the appropriations made by Congress, that while the former exhibit the wants of this branch of service reduced to the lowest point that economy and a regard to reasonable progress will justify, the latter have been far below this limit; and, therefore, that any further reduction could hardly be expected if due regard is had to the defense of the naval and commercial positions of our sea-board frontiers.

With the highest respect, your most obedient servant,

R. E. DE RUSSY,
Lieutenant Colonel Engineers, Com'g.

Hon. JOHN B. FLOYD,
Secretary of War.

PAYMASTER GENERAL'S OFFICE,

December 17, 1860.

SIR: In reply to the letter of the chairman of the Military Committee of the Senate, I have the honor to report that, in my opinion, no reduction can be made in the pay department without serious injury to the service.

The disbursements of this department average \$5,000,000 per annum, and in the present widely dispersed condition of the troops it requires the most untiring efforts of all its officers to make the payments according to law.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

BENJ. F. LARNED,

Paymaster General.

Hon. J. B. FLOYD,

Secretary of War.

BUREAU OF TOPOGRAPHICAL ENGINEERS,*Washington, December 20, 1860.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the reference to this bureau of the resolution of the Senate, as communicated by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, of the 13th instant, inquiring whether the expenses of the military department of the government cannot be reduced, without detriment to the public service, &c.; and in obedience to your direction to report thereupon, I have to state that the estimates for objects under the control of this bureau have been reduced to the least amounts consistent with the interests of the public service.

Respectfully, sir, your obedient servant,

J. J. ABERT,

Colonel Topographical Engineers.

Hon. JOHN B. FLOYD,

Secretary of War.

QUARTERMASTER GENERAL'S OFFICE,*Washington, December 18, 1860.*

SIR: I have had the honor to receive from your office a copy of the letter of the chairman of the military committee of the Senate to you, inquiring "whether the expenses of the military department of the government cannot be reduced, without detriment to the public service."

As our troops are now stationed and employed, the estimate for the next fiscal year made in this office, includes, I think, nothing which can be dispensed with or reduced.

The only way in which the expenditures of the quartermaster's department can be judiciously reduced, that occurs to me, is to dimin-

ish the number of military posts; and, wherever it is practicable, to establish them near the frontiers, or on navigable water; and to make, from those points, expeditions into the Indian countries as often as it may be expedient to do so.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
J. E. JOHNSTON,
Quartermaster General.

Hon. JOHN B. FLOYD,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

ORDNANCE OFFICE,
Washington, December 19, 1860.

SIR: In answer to the letter referred to this office, from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and the Militia, asking for views and opinions on a reduction of the expenses in the military department without detriment to the public service, I have the honor to report:

So far as the particular branch of the military service intrusted to the ordnance department is concerned, I have no doubt that a change in the present organization of its personnel, and in the character and use of its arsenals can be made, which will attain the object of the committee's inquiry. There is a bill before the Senate, reported from its Military Committee, for the better organization of the general staff and the engineer and ordnance departments, which, if enacted, will, in my opinion, reduce expenses in the personnel of those branches, not only without detriment, but with advantage to the public service. That bill embodies provisions for the better organization of what is commonly called the staff and staff corps of the Army, which have heretofore been recommended by the War Department for legislative action, and have met the approval of the Military Committee after full consideration and investigation. The operations of the ordnance department are, in my opinion, now too much scattered: that is to say, we have too many arsenals used as places of construction. This has resulted, in a measure at least, from legislation seeking to distribute public expenditures, instead of concentrating them at a few points, where they can be most effectively and economically applied. It would, in my opinion, be a measure of economy in the construction and preparation of ordnance supplies, as well as one calculated to improve their quality, to confine constructions to four arsenals at most, one at the North, one at the West, one at the South, and one on the Pacific coast. There are a few of the other arsenals, which from their locations, are no longer useful for military purposes, and these should be sold, and the proceeds applied to enlarging the means of fabrication at the four principal arsenals. The other arsenals, which may be conveniently situated for the distribution of supplies from them, should be retained simply as storehouses or depositories, in charge of military storekeepers, or perhaps better, of veteran and worthy sergeants, with a hired or enlisted force only sufficient to keep in order the articles deposited at each. The residue of that force necessary to carry on the

operations of the department, and all the officers not required for detached service with troops, should be concentrated at the arsenals of construction. These are measures the execution of which, in their details, must be left to executive discretion. Legislation can properly confer only the general power to sell and apply the proceeds as above indicated, and to classify and use the other arsenals, four for construction and the remainder for depositories. They are measures which cannot be expected to be carried into effect immediately; but, to be properly executed, must be done gradually. Their beneficial effects, both economically and in other respects, I regard as certain in the end, if systematically and uninterruptedly pursued, although they may be gradual in attainment. Concentration, before recommended for the operations of the ordnance department, applies also as a measure of economy, but in a far higher degree, to the stations of troops. A great source of our military expense lies in the vast number of posts or stations among which our troops are scattered. These posts should be as few as possible for permanent occupation, and the service of protecting our exposed territories should be performed by detachments sent out from and returning to the fixed stations. Such a plan will diminish the now necessarily very large expenses of transportation, as well as many others incident to a multiplicity of small posts, while it is believed confidently that it will rather promote than damage the efficiency of the public service. This idea is not claimed as original. It has been before advanced, and with more elaboration and detail than I have given it. But, as it has not yet been carried into effect, nor I believe fairly and fully tried, I deem it not useless to put it forth again. The measure it suggests does not, in my opinion, require legislation to carry it into effect, and in so far the suggestion may be considered out of place in answer to a call from a committee of a branch of the legislature; but it is, I conceive, a proper and legitimate answer to a call for views and opinions on a reduction of expenses in the military department of the government, even if it tends only to show that legislation is not necessary for all reformations in this respect, and that much may be effected by, if left to, executive management.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

W. MAYNADIER,
Captain of Ordnance

Hon. J. B. FLOYD,
Secretary of War.

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, December 26, 1860.

SIR: I have, pursuant to your directions, the honor to make the following report in answer to the Senate's resolution of the 11th instant, inquiring into the practicability of reducing the present expenditures of the Army, &c.

The amount of money disbursed annually under the direction and control of this office, scarcely exceeds, on an average, \$60,000, and is almost exclusively for the recruiting service. Any very great re-

trenchment, therefore, on so small an amount, is manifestly impracticable. Yet there is one item of expenditure involved in it, that might be suppressed without the slightest "detriment to the public service." Reference is had to the bounty provided by section twenty-nine of the act approved July 5, 1838—an act which, as amended by section eight, act of July 7, 1838, authorizes the payment of three months' extra pay to every soldier who reënlists, under certain conditions there named. Not only is this bounty useless, it is injurious. *Useless*, because an infinitely better bounty for reënlistment is provided in section two of the act of August 4, 1854; the inducements held out by which, for reënlisting, are, moreover, abundantly sufficient. *Injurious*, because many a man now reënlists with the single motive of pocketing this bounty, and then immediately deserts.

As directly connected with this—though the disbursement is one made by the pay department—I would also call the attention of the department to *section three* of an act "to encourage enlistments," &c., approved June 17, 1850, and would recommend its repeal, being satisfied that, whatever effect the bounty there provided may have had in encouraging enlistments, at the time of its passage—that is to say, when the excitement occasioned by the California gold discoveries was at its greatest height—it has no longer the same effect now; for I think it may be safely affirmed that, of the *very few* who enlist for their *first* term of service on our remote frontiers, there is not one who would not have enlisted without this inducement, and that, as an inducement to *reënlist*, it is an unnecessary *addendum* to the act of August 4, 1854.

Finally, as our recruits are nearly all made in the Atlantic cities, and must thence be transported, at a heavy cost, to where their services are needed—in the Indian countries west of the Mississippi river—it follows that for every deserter whom it has to replace, the government is subjected to a certain amount of clear loss; and hence that everything that may tend to suppress desertion, will also tend to reduce the expenditures of the Army.

With a view to this, I would, in the first place, recommend that the amount retained from the soldier's monthly pay be, instead of *one dollar*, as fixed by section five, of the act of July 7, 1838, *two dollars*, as originally resolved in section sixteen of the act of July 5, 1838, or *three dollars*, should this seem best to Congress.

And, as not tending in the least to prevent desertion, but, on the contrary, to prevent many a deserter from returning to his colors, I would, at the same time, urge that the punishment of flogging for desertion be done away with, and that, in lieu of it, if possible, every deserter from the Army be forever *disfranchised*, wherever Congress has the power of doing so—that is to say in all the Territories belonging to the United States. The sympathy so universally felt for deserters among those of their own class, and which now not only facilitates their escape, but encourages to it, would be more effectually destroyed by such a measure, than perhaps by any other which could possibly be devised.

As conducing to the same end, I would also recommend the establishment of an Army Saving's Institution, as well as some law for the

punishment of the imposition practiced upon recruiting officers by minors who, representing themselves as of full age, succeed in getting themselves enlisted on this pretense, and after having been fed and clothed, and transported at a heavy expense by the government to their regiments, are discharged, just as their services are beginning to be of some use, under the operation of the act approved September 28, 1850, section five.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. COOPER,
Adjutant General.

Hon. JOHN B. FLOYD,
Secretary of War.

In order to afford enlisted men of the Army a safe deposit for a sums they may save from their pay, and at the same time to relieve the muster and pay rolls from accumulated credits of pay, the following provision is recommended:

1. All enlisted men present with their companies or detachments at the time of payment shall hereafter sign the receipt for their monthly pay.

2. Soldiers may deposit with the paymaster any portion of their pay, not less than \$5 at one time, provided that no amount so deposited shall be withdrawn until the expiration of the soldier's enlistment.

3. At the time of first deposit a check-book shall be given to the soldier, and a certificate of every sum, signed by the paymaster or company commander, shall be entered therein at the time of deposit.

4. The company commander shall keep an account of every deposit made by a soldier on the company book, and shall transmit to the Paymaster General, after each payment, a list of the depositors and the amounts deposited by them respectively.

5. In case of the transfer of a soldier, his descriptive roll shall exhibit the several amounts deposited by him.

6. On the discharge of a soldier the amount of his deposits shall be entered on his final statements, and paid on settlement of the same.

7. On the death of a soldier his deposits shall be accounted for in the inventory of his effects and on the accompanying final statements.

8. The money deposited by any soldier shall not be liable to forfeiture by sentence of court martial.

9. Paymasters will receive the deposits of the soldiers in their respective districts, credit the same in their accounts current, and furnish a list of the depositors, with the several sums deposited by each, to accompany their accounts and vouchers of disbursements. The sums thus received by the paymasters may be again used by them in the payment of troops.

10. The Paymaster General shall keep in his office such record as may be necessary to show the deposits made by the enlisted men of each company.

The committee, as the result of their examinations, and with a proper view to efficiency and economy in the Army, recommend that bills No. 48 and 61, reported to the Senate in January, 1860, be now passed, with the additional sections herein proposed to the latter bill, the effect of which will be as follows:

First. To abolish the three months extra pay now provided by the act of July 5, 1838, for reënlistments.

Second. To abolish the bounty paid for enlistments made at remote and distant stations by the third section of act of June 17, 1850.

Third. To abolish the premium paid for bringing accepted recruits to the rendezvous.

These provisions are not considered necessary with the present facilities of procuring enlistments and reënlistments in the Army.

The committee also recommend that flogging, as a punishment for desertion, be abandoned, and that disfranchisement forever, where it can be done, be substituted therefor.

And with a view to encourage the soldier to remain without desertion to the end of his period of service, it is proposed that instead of one dollar per month, as now authorized, that two dollars per month be retained from the pay of each enlisted man in the Army until the expiration of his term of enlistment; and as the law now provides that in certain cases the oath of allegiance may be administered to recruits, provision is herein made that in all cases of enlistment and reënlistment the prescribed oath may be administered by any commissioned officer of the Army.